



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/440,149	11/15/1999	ALVIN L. NEELEY	P112554	2595

7590 07/16/2002

ROBERT B HUGHES
HUGHES & SCHACHT PS
SUITE 1
2801 MERIDIAN STREET
BELLINGHAM, WA 98225-2412

EXAMINER

UNDERWOOD, DONALD W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3652

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/440149

Applicant(s)

Neeley et al

Examiner

Underwood

Group Art Unit

3652

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/28/02
- ☒ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-21 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 11, 12, 14-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-9, 13 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 3652

Detailed Action

1. Claims 11, 12 and 14-20 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 4 of parent case 09/233,471.
2. The copywrite symbol in the first line of paragraph 5 in the last Office action, i.e., Paper No 16, should have been (e).
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by UK patent application 2045206.

Note the mechanism can be steered by wheel 65. When the mechanism is pulled right ~~of~~⁵ left by wheel 65 the rear wheels serve as a pivot. This motion is like that of a standard floor jacks.

Art Unit: 3652

5. Claims 1-9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Eckloft et al.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over UK patent application 2045206 or Schmitz² in view of Schaller.

It would have been obvious to use wheels at one end and a non-wheeled pivot at the other end of the mechanism in either primary reference if desiring to rotate a manhole cover from a hole and then back in view of the teaching in Schaller (elements 20, 21).

9. Claims 1-9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British reference 2111017 in view of Schaller.

It would have been obvious to provide wheels to the plates at one end of the beam structure and a pivot to the plate at the other end of the beam structure if desiring to pivot the

Art Unit: 3652

cover away from the hole once lifted in view of the teaching of Schaller. Note 20 and 21 in Schaller.

Regarding claim 9, this does not preclude the use of two threaded members as used in the British reference.

10. Applicant's argument regarding an amendment to claim 1 have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The amendment to claim 1 does not provide a post as argued. Further the wheels 50, 51 in the reference engage the floor to resist movement in that there is friction between the wheels and the floor. As for the pivot movement such is inherent with the front caster wheel and handle.

11. Applicant's argument regarding Schaller have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The Schaller reference is deemed to be in applicant's field of endeavor in that it deals with removing a cover. If one adopts applicant's position that it is not in applicant's field of endeavor, the reference would have still commanded itself to an inventor's attention in considering moving a manhole cover from a hole. Basically to provide a pivot and wheel to move the cover away from the hole.

12. Applicant's position regarding Eckloft have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive in view of 37 CFR 1.601(n) where applicant's invention is invention A and Eckloft is invention B.

13. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. Claim 21 is allowed.

Art Unit: 3652

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREEMONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to D. Underwood at telephone number (703) 308-1113.

Underwood/kl
July 15, 2002

Ronald W. Underwood 07/16/02
RONALD W. UNDERWOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER